For the Northern District of California

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

| 1 | | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 9 | FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | AZADPOUR, | No. C06-3272 MJJ | |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE | |
| 13 | v. | MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTIONS | |
| 14 | SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC. ET AL, | | |
| 15 | Defendants. | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Mostafa Aram Azadpour's Motion for Leave to File Motions. On August 15, 2006, this Court ordered Plaintiff to seek leave of Court before filing any further motions.² The order was in response to the voluminous number of motions and notices of motions filed by Plaintiff, many of which lacked grounding in applicable law and the adjudication of which resulted in the expenditure of considerable judicial resources.

In the present motions, Plaintiff requests permission to file further motions in this Court. Specifically, Plaintiff requests to file the following motions: "Motion to Re-consider [sic] Denial of Leave to Move for a Summary Judgment"; "Motion to Re-consider [sic] Denial for Leave to Move for a Default Judgment"; "Motion for Judgment on Pleadings"; "Motion for Sanction [sic] Against Defendants for Frivolous Motion to Dismiss"; and "Motion for Leave to File Supplemental

¹Docket Nos. 244 and 249.

²C05-4087, Docket No. 199, Filed August 15, 2006.

| Opposition to Oppose Defendants' | Reply Asserting New | Argument in Support o | f Dismissing |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Plaintiff's Amended Complaint." | | | |

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's proposed motions and finds that the motions similarly lack grounding in applicable law and the adjudication of which would result in the unnecessary expenditure of judicial resources.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Motions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July _18, 2007

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE